

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/040,119	01/02/2002	Keng Min Low	BV ARR.001	8782
7:	590 02/10/2005		EXAM	INER
Duke W. Yee			LIN, KELVIN Y	
Carstens, Yee &	& Cahoon, LLP			7 - 7 - 7 - 7 - 7 - 7 - 7 - 7 - 7 - 7 -
P.O. Box 80233	34		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Dallas, TX 75380			2142	

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/040,119	LOW, KENG MIN				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Kelvin Lin	2142				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repleted in the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stature Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thirth will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON te, cause the application to become AB	ply be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. (HS from the mailing date of this communication ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	n.			
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ Thi	is action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allows closed in accordance with the practice under	•	• •	3			
Disposition of Claims	,					
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-42</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-42</u> is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.	•				
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.	•				
10) The drawing(s) filed on <u>24 June 2002</u> is/are: a) ⊠ accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	•		d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Apority documents have been au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		ummary (PTO-413)				
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/5/02</u>. 		/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152) _				

Application/Control Number: 10/040,119 Page 2

Art Unit: 2142

Detailed Action

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

- 2. Claims 1-8, and 10-19, 21-30, 32-42 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Willcox et al., (PG Pub No. 2002/0161840).
- 3. Regarding claim 1, Willcox teaches a method of customizing an element management system, comprising:
 - generating a customized model representing a network element from a base model (Willcox, p.4, [0048], I.3-6, here, the system data model similar to the base model);
 - generating a data channel for the customized model (Willcox, p.1, [0009], I.5, the data channel is the basic concept of XML to categorize the resource as the function of API.)
 - providing a protocol adapter for the customized model (Willcox, p.3.
 [0037], I.1-11); and

Application/Control Number: 10/040,119

Art Unit: 2142

 plugging the customized model into a software bus by way of the protocol adapter and the data channel (Willcox, p.4, [0048], I.6-13).

Page 3

- 4. Regarding claim 2, Willcox further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the base model is a generic representation of a type of network device, and wherein the customized model is a specific representation of a vendor specific instance of the network device (Willcox, p.4, [0047], I.7-8, [0048], I.5-6)
- 5. Regarding claim 3, Willcox further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the base model is a model information base (Willcox, p.4, [0047], I.8-9)
- 6. Regarding claim 4, Willcox further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein generating a data channel includes modifying a base data channel based on functionality of the customized model (Willcox, p.4, [0048], I.4-6).
- 7. Regarding claim 5, Willcox further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein generating a customized model representing a network element from a base model includes compiling an information model into an XML/NMI instance file (Willcox, p.1, [0009], I. 5-7, p.4, [0047], I.8-9)).
- 8. Regarding claim 6, Willcox further discloses the method of claim 5, wherein generating a data channel further includes incorporating the data channel into the XML/NMI instance file (Willcox, p.1, [0009], I.5-7, [0048], I.6-10).
- 9. Regarding claim 7, Willcox further discloses the method of claim 5, wherein providing a protocol adapter includes:
 - determining a protocol used by the network element (Willcox, p.5, [0059], l. 1-4); and

Application/Control Number: 10/040,119

Art Unit: 2142

 incorporating a protocol adapter that performs conversion of messages from the protocol used by the network element to a protocol used by an element management system framework (Willcox p.5, [0059], I.8-14).

Page 4

- 10. Regarding claim 8, Willcox further discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising: defining a presentation screen; and linking the presentation screen with a network service, wherein the presentation screen is used to view information obtained from the network element (Willcox, p.4, [0055], I.1-8).
- 11. Regarding claim 10, Willcox further discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising customizing business logic associated with the customized model (Willcox, p.3, I.9-16).
- 12. Regarding claim 11, Willcox further discloses the method of claim 10, wherein customizing the business logic includes:

 defining the business logic in the Action Language; and compiling the Action Language into executable code (Willcox, p.4, [0056], l.6-7, the action language is the query language).
- 13. Regarding claims 12-19, and 21-22 have similar limitations as claims 1-8, 10-11. Therefore, claims 12-19, and 21-22 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-8, 10-11.
- 14. Regarding claims 23-30, and 32-33 have similar limitations as claims 1-8, 10-11.

 Therefore, claims 23-30, and 32-33 are rejected for the same reasons set forth

Art Unit: 2142

in the rejection of claims 1-8, 10-11.

- 15. Regarding claim 34, Willcox further discloses the method of claim 8, wherein defining a presentation screen includes:
 - generating a XML/UIL file defining the presentation screen (Willcox, p.1, [0009], I.5-7,p.4, [0054], I.10-14, [0055], I.1-8); and
 - rendering the presentation screen by processing the XML/UIL
 file (Willcox, p.1, [0009], I.5-7,p.4, [0054], I.10-14, [0055], I.1-8);
- 16. Regarding claim 35, Willcox further discloses the method of claim 35, wherein rendering the presentation screen by processing the XML/UIL file includes: instantiating one or more Java beans based on instructions obtained from the XML/UIL file (Willcox, p.3, [0045], I.1-7).
- 17. Regarding claim 36, Willcox further discloses the method of claim 36, wherein the one or more Java beans include application program logic for capturing and acting upon user events associated with one or more elements of the presentation screen, the one or more elements of the presentation screen being associated with the one or more Java beans (Willcox, p.3, [0045], I.1-7).
- 18. Regarding claims 37-39 have similar limitations as claims 34-36.
 Therefore, claims 37-39 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 34-36.
- 19. Regarding claims 40-42 have similar limitations as claims 34-36.

 Therefore, claims 40-42 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 34-36.

Art Unit: 2142

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 20. Claims 9, 20, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willcox in view of Suzuki et al., (Publication titled "Makin UML models exchangeable over the Internet with XML, June, 1998").
- 21. Regarding claim 9, Willcox differs from the claimed invention in that it does not explicitly indicate the UML. However, Suzuki clearly teaches the UML can be exchanged by XML, because the UML does not have an explicit format for exchanging its models intentionally. And based on XML the exchangeable format UXF based on XML is powerful enough to express, publish, access and exchange UML, models. Similarly, claims 20, and 31 have similar limitations as claim 9. Therefore, claims 20, and 31 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 9.
- 22. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Suziki's exchangeable XML (UXF) with Willcox Interface adapter.
- 23. Claims 34, 35, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willcox in view of Zimmermann et al., (PG Pub No.

Application/Control Number: 10/040,119 Page 7

Art Unit: 2142

2002/0107999).

- 24. Regarding claims 34, 35, and 36, Willcox teach all the limitation of claims 34,35, and 36, except for the UIL. Zimmermann teaches the XML based User Interface Language which is intended for construction user interface and developed by the Mozilla Organization from the XML language, in view of the Zimmermann develop environment, which include the CORBA, XML, and C++ server (Zimmeramann, p.4. [0084], I.1-8), is similar to Willcox development environment.
- 25. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Zimmermann's UIL with Willcox's middleware solution.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to application's disclosure.

- Jennings T., (Patent No. 6717593) Mark-Up Language Implementation
 Of Graphical Or Non-Graphical User Interface.
- Elwahab et al., (PG Pub No. 2002/0023258) System And Method For Managing Telecommunications Devices.
- Jabri M. (PG Pub. No. 2002/0066074) Method And System For
 Developing And Executing Software Applications At An Abstract Design
 Level.
- NPL Suzuki et al., Making UML models exchangeable over the
 Internet with XML: UXF Approach, UML '98 (1998).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kelvin Lin whose telephone number is 703-605-1726.

The examiner can normally be reached on Flexible 4/9/5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Harvey can be reached on 703-305-9705. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kyl 2/05/05

The Life Vice of the Control of the